

## Meeting Record

To:		From:	
Name:	Tony Danna, Earl Nelson and meeting attendees	Name:	Elizabeth Boyd
Firm:	DWR - DFM	Firm:	AECOM
Fax number:		Date Sent:	May 5, 2011
Meeting Date:	April 21, 2011		
Project Name:	Lower Feather River Corridor Management Strategy		
Project Number:	08110038.16		
List of Attendees:	See last page for attendee list		
Subject:	Draft Lower Feather River Corridor Management Strategy Meeting		
Distribution: Attendees			

The following is a summary of the meeting held on April 21, 2011.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
<b>1. Introductions</b>	<b>Facilitation &amp; Note taking</b> <b>Review Meeting Notes from last meeting (March 17, 2011)</b> <b>Review Meeting Agenda</b>	Please give your changes to the March 17 notes back to Elizabeth Boyd by early next week. She will give the notes to Tony and then get it to the Web.
<b>2. Corridor Management Plan Status Report</b>	<b>Timeline Update</b> Tony presented the overview of what will be happening throughout the process and what phases will be happening when. The goal is to have the CMP signed and endorsed by June 30, 2012, coinciding with the CVFPP release.  Question: Are the dates presented on the slide reasonable?  Answer: Permitting may take longer. The only thing we need by June 30 is the plan endorsement.  In Phase 3, are we trying to get the MOUs done? There is no hard date for that to happen. The only hard date we are facing is the legal end date for the CVFPP and they have to have a CMP. We are the pilot project for a CMP so we need to have something to give them.  Question about Phase 3 CEQA/NEPA, what does that mean? We don't need to have any particular CEQA/NEPA compliance needs for CVFP Board endorsement. The plan doesn't necessarily trigger the need for CEQA/NEPA. Permitting is the action that will	Look at how well the O'Conner Lakes MOU is functioning today? Earl will look into this.  DFG/FWS and DWR need to get together regarding the short-term strategy. The short-term strategy will be addressed in the permitting subcommittee meeting.

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>require CEQA/NEPA compliance.</p> <p>Earl talked about the deliverables for Phase 2. See slide. Public input will be sought during this phase and could influence the next task order. He clarified that the plan and the project description are not the same thing.</p> <p><b>Task Order #33 Progress Report</b> The signed task order should be complete by mid May.</p> <p>The completion date for the TO has changed from end of December 2011 to end of February 2012.</p> <p><b>DFG Feather River Wildlife Area MOU</b> This is in final legal review. Future acquisitions are addressed in the MOU.</p> <p>Question: Is there a movement to get an MOU with the FWS on the species covered in the DFG MOU?</p> <p>Answer (FWS): We haven't gotten there yet. How can we provide the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle coverage? There is no Section 7 nexus. The purpose of the CMP process is to accomplish this. Though there is a hope for a short-term solution.</p> <p>Some additional discussion on how the O'Conner Lakes BO is able to accomplish some of the short-term needs. Like to include the privately owned land.</p> <p>Paul would like to see the de-listing of the VELB. Question: Can there be something that is done to help with the de-listing. Earl said that DWR is not able to help out with that at this time. Central Valley Flood Control Association is already working on this.</p> <p>Answer (FWS): There is a certain process that has to be gone through. It's close to the point to send the de-listing package up the chain. It's probably not useful to provide special funding to FWS because they are past that point.</p> <p>Question (Paul): Can some timeline information be put out there to help inform.</p> <p>Answer: There is no anticipated timeline</p> <p>The new DFG MOU addresses existing and future projects.</p>	
<p><b>3. Hydraulic Modeling Subcommittee</b></p>	<p><b>Final progress report on Task Order Hydraulic Modeling</b> Jeff provided notes to those attending. See attached. Question on whether anyone from DFG was involved. It didn't look like they were on the list.</p> <p>Hoping to have an open exchange for all the models.</p> <p>Discussed that Sutter Butte may be exploring some setbacks and it may make sense to expand the 2D model to include that area.</p> <p>Question: Isn't there 2D modeling going on in the bypass?</p> <p>Answer: The Sutter bypass efforts are looking at what</p>	

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>is going on in the bypass. But by expanding this modeling effort, it should be clear in the confluence area.</p> <p>Question: Is 3-foot freeboard the minimum requirement? What are the implications of not meeting the minimum?</p> <p>Answer: Yes, 3-foot is the minimum but some areas are seeking 100-year rather than 200-year.</p> <p>Comment that 784's levees are fine for 200-year protection.</p> <p>Comment that southern areas are kept in agriculture, not for urban development. And that's why we're not pursuing 200-year. 100-year protection is necessary for agriculture only.</p> <p>Question: Is there a problem with federal crop subsidies in areas without 100-year flood protection?</p> <p>Answer: Grant subsidy has a high level of being refused but that hasn't happened previously. It's not standard practice, but if they followed the letter of the law, it would be possible.</p>	
<b>4. Permitting Subcommittee</b>	<p><b>Next Permitting Meeting</b></p> <p>Lisa led a discussion on who should be part of the subcommittee.</p> <p>When the new TO is in place AECOM will incorporate the permitting subcommittee agencies' comments on the Permitting Strategy Letter Report into a technical memo.</p> <p>Need a PD to move forward.</p> <p>Looking at a twofold project description. Short-term project description and long-term. Short-term would include a list of upcoming projects. Should include what is happening in the next 2 years. What do you need authorized before the programmatic authorizations are in place? The short-term project description will cover projects, whereas the long-term project description will not identify projects but will list types of maintenance and restoration activities.</p> <p>For short-term PD: Need project name, size, location, extent, activities, description, timing, duration, project proponent, list of permits anticipated.</p> <p><b><u>Next meeting (May 11) will review short-term PD</u></b></p>	<p>Include Regulatory/permitting agencies, Terri Gaines, Debra Bishop, Jeff Twitchell, Paul Brunner, and Stan Cleveland.</p> <p>Tony will take a shot at the short-term project description and have that ready for attendees to look at. By Wednesday, May 4.</p> <p>Lisa proposes using May 11, at JOC as the meeting time, 10am-12pm.</p> <p>Project proponents to get list of short-term projects to Tony by May 3.</p> <p>Tony will send an email to the subcommittee members identifying the key action items and an outlook calendar request for the May 11 meeting directly after this meeting.</p>
<b>5. Sutter Buttes Flood Control Agency</b>	<p><b>US Army Corps of Engineers Feasibility Study</b></p> <p>Dave from PBI, working for SBFCA gave the presentation, as seen on the meeting page. SBFCA will be coming out with an updated calibration of the model by end of June. Clarification that "optimized" means economically optimized.</p> <p>Clarification that flood depth in the north would be much less than in the south. There is excess freeboard in the</p>	<p>Check into having a table or other coordination with SBFCA for their public outreach.</p> <p>SBFCA (Dave) to provide most current program schedule to Tony.</p>

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>north.</p> <p>There are some criteria issues caused by having levees that are completely freeboard, flood being contained within the stream bed itself. If you have to consider "top of levee", an issue is presented that wouldn't be there if the levee wasn't there.</p> <p>Seeking to do what has to be done and not what would be nice to do because of financial limitations.</p> <p><b>Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project</b></p> <p>See slides starting "Comparison Of FRWL Rehabilitation Project to Natomas Levee Improvement Project".</p> <p>Question about who has talked to the landowners about setback levees. Sounds like no one has pursued this as far as this group knows.</p> <p>First step is to analyze the costs of different setback levee alternatives and then analyze the hydraulic benefits.</p> <p>Question: Noticed that the final documents are also 2012 (like the CVFPP). Are those being coordinated?</p> <p>Answer: Hasn't been coordinated. But is looking at the Corps EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Question (NMFS): Have you been working with the resource agencies?</p> <p>Answer: Yes, we've been working with the Corps, DWR, and CVFPP. Have not begun consultations with DFG or USFWS or NMFS.</p> <p>Suggestion to begin that sooner to have preliminary discussion. Sounds like it's in the Jones and Stokes plan to do so.</p> <p>Suggestion to coordinate with CVFPP to ensure that this project meets the requirements for "no regrets" assumed for EIP projects.</p> <p>Anticipate scoping to happen in June 2011. Joint scoping for SBFCA and Corps documents.</p> <p>Clarification that the CMP effort be coordinated with the outreach for SBFCA so that it's clear who is doing what.</p> <p>There are scoping meetings scheduled for the SBFCA project for June 27/28. Public information meetings on April 25 (5-9 at Flower House Yuba City Fair on Franklin Ave), 27 (6-8pm, Yuba City's Vet Hall), 28 (6-8pm, Gridley High School). Intent is to go to the public with information on how their money is being spent. NOP will be going out in the next few weeks.</p> <p>Kim Floyd (916-838-2666) is the public affairs person. Doing a "science fair" type of meeting. CMP group is invited to have a table.</p>	
<b>6. Project Description, Activities, &amp; Thresholds</b>	<b>Locations of proposals from previous Delphi scenario, field tour, and concept meetings</b>	Tony will put the current DFG RMA onto the Web site so group members can reference this

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION ITEMS
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Tony continued presentation (starting at slide titled "Lower Feather River CMP").</p> <p><b>Subcommittee development</b>  Tony asked for suggestions about how it can be split up and if subcommittees can be used to look at things geographically.</p> <p>Tony suggested breaking the CMP coverage area into four geographic "segments", and breaking the covered activities into three classes based on level of impacts, i.e. low, moderate and substantial.</p> <p>Clarification that many things will be discussed in the plan but may not be in the project description as an activity for permitting.</p> <p>Clarification that there would need to be thresholds for sediment removal.</p> <p>Clarification that agriculture will be addressed in the plan but it won't be in the project description because they don't need a permit. Will describe it as an existing use.</p> <p>Suggestion to consider some of the voluntary permits, like Safe Harbor, etc.</p> <p>Discussion over two suggestions previously given by Keith Swanson that sediment could be moved to the landside of the levees. Getting the sediment out of the system and using it to help. Are there studies to show that sediment is a hydrologic constraint?</p> <p><b><u>Use the permitting subcommittee for further discussion on how to deal with the long-range project description.</u></b></p>	<p>document.</p> <p>Tony will post the presentation and email a link to that.</p> <p>Tony requested that the work group members provide comments on his suggested approach for breaking down the CMP geographically and by level of impact.</p> <p>Need to get a head count of who will be able to attend the May 19<sup>th</sup> site visit.</p>
<b>7. Next Meeting</b>	<p>There is a 15 person limit per boat trip.</p> <p>Suggestion to go to Nelson Slough but it's scheduled on the left bank for RD 1001.</p> <p>Other opportunities are to meet at the stops.</p>	<p>Tony will send out a meeting request.</p>

**END OF NOTES**

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by AECOM within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

# Lower Feather River Corridor Management Plan Thursday, April 21, 2011 Meeting Work Group Member Attendance

Participant	Affiliation	Telephone #
Earl Nelson	FPCP Department of Water Resources	916-574-1244
Tony Danna	FMO Department of Water Resources	916-574-2738 916-531-2410 c
Kelly Barker	Department of Fish & Game – Northern Central Region	916-358-4353
Debra Bishop	H.T. Harvey	530-753-3733 x 102
Paul Brunner (on the phone)	Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority	530-749-5679
Erin Brehmer	FPCP Department of Water Resources	906-574-2236
James Cornelius	Sutter Co. Resource Conservation District	530-674-1461
Terri Gaines (on the phone)	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-653-6520
Jennifer Hobbs	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	916-414-6541
Ryan Larson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	916-557-7568
Ray McDowell	FESSRO Department of Water Resources	916-651-7192
Jeffery E. Twitchell	Levee District 1 & Yuba City Basin	916-631-4555
Elizabeth Boyd	AECOM	916-414-5852
Stanley Cleveland	Sutter County Board	530-713-7502
Sean Bechta	AECOM	916-414-5876
Steve Fordice	River District 784	530-742-0520
Lisa Mangione	AECOM	916-414-1605
Helen Swagerty	River Partners	530-894-5401 x227
Tina Bartlett	Department of Fish and Game	916-358-2898
Dale Whitmore	Department of Fish and Game	530-743-5068 Email: <a href="mailto:dwhitmore@dfg.ca.gov">dwhitmore@dfg.ca.gov</a>
Lee Fredericksen	HDR (SBFCA)	916-213-0569
Dave Peterson	PBI (SBFCA)	916-792-6285
Lisa A. Grudzinski (on the phone)	USACE	530-223-9538
Michael Hendrick (on the phone)	NOAA	916-930-3605